

### IN THE CLAIMS

In accordance with amendment practice pursuant to Rule 1.121(c)(1)(i), presented below is a “clean” copy of the rewritten claim. A “marked up” version of claim 1 is attached hereto as Exhibit 2 pursuant to Rule 1.121(c)(1)(ii).

Please amend the claims as follows:

1. (Thrice Amended) A process for the isolation of vitamin D<sub>3</sub> or previtamin D<sub>3</sub> from a mixture containing vitamin D<sub>3</sub> or previtamin D<sub>3</sub>, which process comprises separating the vitamin D<sub>3</sub> or previtamin D<sub>3</sub> by a normal phase column chromatographic technique with back-pressure regulation, wherein a mobile phase of the chromatography comprises supercritical carbon dioxide.

Please cancel claims 7 and 8, without prejudice.

### REMARKS

The specification has been amended to correct the recitation of “Fig. 3” to “Fig. 2.” This is an obvious typographical error, since there are only 2 figures in the specification, and Figure 1 is discussed before the Example in the specification. Accordingly, the Example can only be referring to Fig. 2. As is well settled, an amendment “to correct an error is not new matter if one skilled in the art would appreciate not only the existence of the error in the specification but what the error is.” *Ex Parte Brodbeck*, 199 USPQ 230, 231 (Bd. App. 1977); *In re Oda*, 170 USPQ 268, 271 (CCPA 1971). This is just such a case. The above amendment merely corrects what is an obvious error.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that “the mobile phase ... comprises supercritical carbon dioxide,” and to recite a “normal phase column chromatographic technique